

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

With this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 121 and adds new claims 132 and 133. No new matter is added. Claims 1, 4, 9-18 and 121-133 are currently pending in the application. Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 9-18, 121-127, 130 & 131 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 4, 9-18, 121-127, 130 and 131 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hertzog et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2003/0069874; hereinafter “Hertzog”), Rensin et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2002/0152332; hereinafter “Rensin”) and further in view of Wiryawan et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2007/0239709; hereinafter “Wiryawan”).

A. Independent Claim 1

In contrast to amended claim 1, Applicant submits that Hertzog, Rensin and Wiryawan, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest and are altogether silent regarding an apparatus comprising, *inter alia*, processors configured for: (A) *mapping a plurality of fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software to a plurality of corresponding fields of a web page* of a web application to produce mapping data; and (B) wherein said step of *mapping* comprises *generating a display, in response to receipt of the web page from a web server, prompting a user of the apparatus to map respective fields of the contact data from the PIM software to respective fields of the web page that is received from the web server*, as recited by claim 1.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on paragraphs [0013]-[0014], [0023], [0030]-[0032] and [0036] as well as FIG. 5 of Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, for the proposition that the combination allegedly discloses “generating a display prompting a user of the apparatus to map respective fields ...” (See pg. 6 of the Office Action)

In contrast to claim 1, the cited portion and indeed all of Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, at most discloses transferring of data between user-

specified fields associated with a defined source business component and a defined destination business component. (paragraphs [0013]-[0014] of Wiryawan) In this regard, Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, at most describes that mapping of data includes initiation of a data transfer utility software application configured to enable the user to define source and destination components and/or fields to map the transfer of data. (paragraphs [0014] & [0023] of Wiryawan) In order to facilitate the data transfer, Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, explains that the user may define a source business object 601 associated with the data to be transferred and a destination business object 603 (alleged web page)¹ to which the data will be transferred. (paragraphs [0031]-[0032] of Wiryawan)

However, nowhere in Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, is there any mention, teaching or suggestion that the destination business object 603 (alleged web page) is received by the computer 401 from another device such as a server, as would be required by the recitations of claim 1. And there certainly is no mention, teaching or suggestion relating to any step of mapping that comprises generating *a display, in response to receipt* of the destination business object 603 from *a web server*, prompting a user of the computer 401 to map respective fields of the source business object 601 (alleged PIM software)² to respective fields of the destination business object 603, as would be required by the recitations of claim 1.

Rather, Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, at most discloses that the user defines the source business object 601 and the destination business object 603. (paragraphs [0014], [0030] & [0036] of Wiryawan) However, Wiryawan, alone or in combination with Hertzog and Rensin, is altogether silent and does not contemplate that the destination business object 603 (alleged web page) is received by the computer 401 from any other device and does not teach or suggest generating a display *in response to receipt* of the destination business object 603 *from a web server*, prompting the user of the computer 401 to map respective fields of the source business object to respective fields of the destination business object 603, as would be required by the recitations of claim 1.

¹ See pg. 6 of the Office Action.

² See pg. 6 of the Office Action.

Based on at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the combination of Hertzog, Rensin and Wiryawan is deficient and does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 4, 9-18, 124, 126 and 130.

B. Independent Claim 121

Independent claim 121, as herein amended, recites a computer program product comprising at least one computer-readable storage medium having computer-readable program code portions stored therein. The computer-readable program code portions comprise, *inter alia*, an executable portion configured to *map a plurality of fields of contact data from personal information manager (PIM) software to a plurality of corresponding fields of a web page of a web application to produce mapping data. The mapping of the fields of the contact data and the web page comprises generating a display, in response to receipt of the web page from a web server, prompting a user of an apparatus to map the respective fields of the contact data from the PIM software to respective fields of the web page that is received from the web server.*

Since independent claim 121 contains features that are in some respects analogous to the features recited in independent claim 1, Applicant submits that independent claim 121 and its dependent claims 122, 123, 125, 127 and 131 are patentable at least for reasons analogous to those submitted for claim 1.

II. Rejection of Claims 128 & 129 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 128 and 129 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hertzog, Rensin, Wiryawan and further in view of Yashiro et al. (U.S. Patent Appln. Publn. No. 2003/0033260; hereinafter “Yashiro”). Applicant thanks the Examiner for confirming during the telephone call dated March 29, 2010 that Rensin was meant to be part of this § 103(a) rejection as opposed to Swan. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

As discussed above, Hertzog, Rensin and Wiryawan, taken individually or in combination, are deficient vis-à-vis independent claims 1 and 121 and Yashiro does not make up

for the deficiencies of Hertzog, Rensin and Wiryawan and is not cited for such. Accordingly, Applicant submits that dependent claims 128 and 129 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 121. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 103(a) rejection of dependent claims 128 and 129.

III. New Claims

Applicant herein adds new claims 132 and 133 to provide more varied protection of Applicant's invention as described in the specification. In addition to their respective dependencies from claims 1 and 121, Applicant submits that new claims 132 and 133 recite independently patentable subject matter since the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of new claims 132 and 133.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued in due course. Examiner Zhen is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Appl. No.: 10/607,907
Amdt. dated April 12, 2010
Reply to Office Action of January 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cory Davis", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Cory C. Davis
Registration No. 59,932

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Atlanta Office (404) 881-7000
Fax Atlanta Office (404) 881-7777

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON April 12, 2010.